

PAUL S. KLEIN,)	3:08-CV-00191-LRH-VPC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
vs.)	
)	
HOWARD SKOLNIK, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff does not need a certificate of appealability. The requirement for a certificate of appealability applies to claims for habeas corpus relief, rather than to civil rights claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See Dalluge v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice, No. C11-5037RBL, 2011 WL 1675407, at *1 (W.D. Wash. May 4, 2011) (“As this case was brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, there is no requirement for a certificate of appealability.”); Jenkins v. Caplan, No. C 02-5603 RMW (PR), 2010 WL 3057410, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2010) (“[A] Certificate of Appealability is inapplicable to a § 1983 action.”); Moore v. Hindmarch, No. CV 09-1461-PHX-GMS (JRI), 2010 WL 3283567, at *1

1 (D.Ariz. Aug. 18, 2010) (“[A} certificate of appealability is not required to appeal the dismissal and
2 entry of judgment in a *pro se* civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”).

3 **IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion for a certificate of
4 appealability (#359) is **DENIED** as moot.

5
6 DATED this 16th day of May, 2012.



7
8 LARRY R. HICKS
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28